

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments to the specification and claims and the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 14, 20 to 22, 24 and 25, all other claims having been cancelled. Claims 21, 22, 24 and 25 remain in the application as the Examiner indicated these claims will be rejoined with the compound claims if they were found allowable.

The specification has been amended to put in headings and to amend formula V as suggested by the Examiner. Paragraph 6 has been complied with and the cancellation of claim 5 obviates the Examiner's objections thereto.

Claims 14 to 20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner states that while over eighty compounds have been synthesized, only 14 specific compounds fall into Group I.

Applicants traverse this ground of rejection as it is believed the specification properly teaches one skilled in the art how to prepare the compounds by the 82 specific examples and the general discussion on pages 31 to 48 of how to prepare the different types of compounds. Moreover, at least 41 compounds have been demonstrated to have the claimed utility. The Applicants could not guess how the Examiner would cup up

Applicants' genus and this is why only 14 to the 82 specific compounds fall within the present claims. Applicants have clearly taught one skilled in the art how to prepare the claimed compounds and have taught how to use the compounds. Therefore, Applicants have complied with 35 USC 112 and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

Claims 14 to 19 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by the Aslam et al. reference which according to the Examiner teaches the claimed compounds where R_{18} , R_{19} , R_{20} , R_{21} , R_{22} and R_{39} are hydrogen, B is $-NH_2$, X is $-(CH_2)_m-(CO)$, Y is a bond and Φ is $-(CH_2)_m-O-(CH_2)_n$ and m and n are 0. It is noted that claim 20 was not rejected on the prior art.

Applicants traverse this ground of rejection since the Aslam reference does not anticipate or render obvious the present claims. The Aslam reference discloses derivatives of dulcin which the present claims do not relate to. Dulcin-p-amino-benzoic acid compounds are complex and many different preparations of them are taught but not the present claims wherein B is thiophene and Φ is $-(CH_2)_p-NR_{23}-(CH_2)_q$. Moreover, Aslam does not disclose any utility for the compounds, much less the utility of claims 21, 22, 24 and 25. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

In view of the amendments to the specification and claims and the above remarks,
it is believed that the claims point out the Applicants' patentable contribution and
favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Hedman and Costigan

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Charles A. Muserlian", is written over a horizontal line.

Charles A. Muserlian, 19,683
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Tel. # (212) 302 8989

CAM:mlp
Enclosure